



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,643	10/15/2003	David Morrow	WLI 1096 PUS	2642
27256	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C. 28333 TELEGRAPH RD. SUITE 250 SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			CHAMBERS, MICHAEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 23-24, 26-30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harmala et al (5320386). Harmala discloses a hollow metal tube having a non-metal insert that is lightweight and made from titanium (fig 2, 4:8-11, 4:37-41). In as much structure set forth by the applicant in the claims, the device is capable of use in the intended manner if so desired (See MPEP 2111-2112).

As to claim 2: Harmala discloses a reinforcing insert that extends across the length of the hollow tube (fig 2).

As to claim 3: Harmala discloses an insert that extends around an inner circumference (fig 2).

As to claims 4-6: Harmala discloses a reinforcing insert that is coupled to the top, intermediate and end portion (fig 2).

As to claims 23-24 : Harmala discloses an insert having a substantial thickness (fig 2).

As to claim 26 : See claim 1 rejection.

As to claim 28 : Harmala discloses an insert that extends the length of the metal tube (fig 1,2).

As to claims 29-30: Harmala discloses a reinforcing insert that is coupled at the first and second end (fig 1,2).

As to claim 32 : Harmala discloses a uniform thickness (fig 1,2).

As to claim 33 : Harmala discloses an insert (fig 1,2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harmala as applied to claim 1 above. The type of reinforcing material is a matter of design choice. The specification provides no unexpected results in using a foam or fiberglass (paragraph 10 of specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an appropriate material for reinforcement based on cost and manufacturing methods.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harmala as applied to claim 1 and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art. The specification provides no unanticipated results from this limitation. Official Notice was taken in the prior office action that the use of multiple reinforcing inserts is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have employed multiple sections of reinforcing inserts based on cost and manufacturing and design considerations.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harmala as applied to claim 26 above. The type of reinforcing material is a matter of design choice. The specification provides no unexpected results in using a foam or fiberglass (paragraph 10 of specification). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an appropriate material for reinforcement based on cost and manufacturing methods.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loyd as applied to claim 26 above. The thickness of the insert is a matter of design choice. The specification provides no unexpected results in using a thickness larger on one half of the handle than the other half. Various types of manufacturing methods would cause this type of limitation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an appropriate thickness based on cost and manufacturing methods.

Also,

Claims 1-7,21, 23-24,26-30 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brine et al (6752730) in view of Hoult (3702702) and McNeely (5511777). Brine discloses the elements of claim 1 however it fails to disclose the use of a tubular reinforcing member. McNeely discloses the use of a tubular reinforcing member having a uniform inner cavity (fig 1b). Hoult discloses it is old in the art to reinforce a lacrosse handle (fig 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have employed reinforcing member of McNeely with the device of Brine in order to provide a more sturdy and durable device for the player.

As to claim 2: McNeely discloses a reinforcing insert that extends across the length of the hollow tube (fig 1,1b).

As to claim 3: McNeely discloses a insert that extends around an inner circumference (fig 1,1b).

As to claims 4-6: Hoult discloses a reinforcing insert that is coupled to the top, intermediate and end portion (fig 5).

As to claims 23 -24 : McNeely discloses an insert having a substantial thickness (fig 1,1b).

As to claim 26 : See claim 1 rejection.

As to claim 28 : Hoult discloses an insert that extends the length of the metal tube (fig 5).

As to claims 29-30: Hoult discloses a reinforcing insert that is coupled at the first and second end (fig 1,5).

As to claim 31 : McNeely discloses a foam material (5:40-46).

As to claim 32 : McNeely discloses a uniform thickness (fig 1, 1b).

As to claim 33 : McNeely discloses an insert (fig 1, 1b).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited art as applied to claim 1 and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art. The specification provides no unanticipated results from this limitation. Official Notice was

Art Unit: 3711

taken in the prior office action that the use of multiple reinforcing inserts is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed multiple sections of reinforcing inserts based on cost and manufacturing and design considerations.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited art as applied to claim 26 above. The thickness of the insert is a matter of design choice. The specification provides no unexpected results in using a thickness larger on one half of the handle than the other half. Various types of manufacturing methods would cause this type of limitation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected an appropriate thickness based on cost and manufacturing methods.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Chambers whose telephone number is 571-272-4407. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3711


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6752730*3702702*5511777*5320386

Michael Chambers
Examiner
Art Unit 3711

October 28, 2005


EUGENE KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER